

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 8-34 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 2 and 8-34 are currently amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that entry of the currently amended claims is proper because the currently amended claims will either place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Applicant further respectfully submits that no new matter is added to the currently amended claims, nor has the scope of the pending claims changed. Accordingly, no new issues are raised that necessitate a further search of art.

Claims 2, and 8-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 2 and 8-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 2, 8, and 15, and their dependent claims, Applicants currently amended these claims to more clearly describe a system comprising physical hardware. For example, currently amended claim 2 recites in part, "a master central processing unit (CPU) that produces a first set of signals and a second set of signals for verifying said design element in response to signals produced by running a verification case", "a verification logic device connected to said SOC interface", and "wherein said verification logic device verifies said design element based on inputs from said first set of signals and said second set of signals". Independent claims 8 and 15, and those claims depending from independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are similarly amended in like manner.

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 21 and 28, and their dependent claims, Applicants currently amended these claims to more clearly describe a method directed to using physical hardware. For example, currently amended claim 21 recites in part, "producing a first set of signals and a second set of signals by a master central processing unit (CPU) of an SOC, which includes said design element, in response to running a verification case on said master CPU" and "inputting said first set of signals, received by said second EBIU, into said verification logic device; inputting said second set of signals, received by from said SOC

interface, into said verification logic device; and verifying said design element based on inputs from said first set of signals and said second set of signals to said verification logic device". Independent claims 28 and those claims depending from independent claims 21 and 28 are similarly amended in like manner.

With respect to the phrase, "said verification test interface", lacking antecedent basis in claims 26 and 33, Applicants currently amended these claims to delete the phrase.

In view of the currently amended claims above and the exemplary reasons outlined immediately above, Applicants respectfully submit that currently amended claims 2 and 8-34 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as their invention, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 8-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully solicited.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 2, 8-14, 15-20, 21-27, and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the Final Action asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In particular, the Final Action asserts that regarding claims 2, 8-14, and 15-20, the claims are directed to a system for verification of a system-on-a-chip, but none of the claim limitations appear to expressly or inherently require tangible physical components. More particularly, the Final Action asserts that all of the claim components appear to be software elements, including, the CPU, the SOC interface, and the EBIU interfaces (Final Action, page 5, section 7a).

In the currently amended claims above, Applicants respectfully aver that a CPU and an interface are, indeed, hardware. Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 20th edition, 2004 defines Central Processing Unit CPU as, "The part of a computer which performs the logic, computational and decision-making functions. It interprets and executes instructions as it receives them. Personal computers have one CPU, typically a single chip. It is the so-called 'computer on a chip.' That chip identifies them as an 8-bit, 16-bit or 32-bit machine." Likewise, Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 20th edition, 2004 defines interface as, "1. A mechanical or electrical link connecting two or more pieces of equipment together."

The Final Action also asserts that the independent claims do not appear to perform verification or produce a result that may be used in a practical application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the currently amended independent claims produce a practical result, i.e., "wherein said verification logic device verifies said design element based on inputs from said first set of signals and said second set of signals", as recited in currently amended claims 1, 8, and 15, and "verifying said design element based on inputs from said first set of signals and said second set of signals to said verification logic device", as recited in currently amended claims 21 and 28.

In view of the currently amended claims above and the exemplary reasons outlined immediately above, Applicants respectfully submit that currently amended claims 2 and 8-34 are directed to statutory matter and fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 8-34 under U.S.C. §101 is respectfully solicited.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

Claims 2 and 8-34 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully submits that entry of currently amended claims 2 and 8-34 is proper because the currently amended claims will either place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Applicant further respectfully submits that no new matter is added to the currently amended claims, nor has the scope of the pending claims changed. Accordingly, no new issues are raised that necessitate a further search of art

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 8-34, all the claims presently pending in the application, have been amended to overcome the objections and rejections, and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest time possible.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2008

/Peter A. Balnave/
Peter A. Balnave, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,199

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (410) 573-5255
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Email: Balnave@Gibb-Rahman.com
Customer Number: 29154